

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-27 are pending. Claims 1-13 were canceled in a previous amendment. Claim 14 is amended. Claim 27 is newly added. Claims 23-26 are withdrawn. Support for the amendment to Claim 14 can be found in Fig. 1e and in numbered paragraph [0047] of the published application, for example. Support for newly added Claim 27 can be found in original Claim 14, Fig. 1e, and numbered paragraph [0047], for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 14-16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Gressenich et al. (German Patent No. 19633706, herein "Gressenich") in view of Kosmas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,492,624, herein "Kosmas"). Claims 17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Gressenich in view of Kosmas and further in view of Goetz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,189, herein "Goetz") or Hoffmann (U.S. Patent No. 5,155,338, herein "Hoffmann"). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Gressenich in view of Kosmas and further in view of Medwick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,849,328, herein "Medwick").

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 14 as obvious over Gressenich in view of Kosmas, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 14 recites, in part:

wherein at least one smooth region, free of pegs, is reserved in a location on the first surface, in a mounted position, face to face with one or more elements viewable through the at least one smooth region, and the second surface includes a raised boss in a neighboring area opposite the at least one smooth region.

Accordingly, a second surface, which is opposite a first surface provided with pegs, includes a raised boss in a neighboring area opposite at least one smooth region disposed on the first surface.

In contrast, Gressenich, as shown in Figs. 1a-4b, does not teach or suggest a boss disposed on a side opposite at least one smooth region on a first surface.

Kosmas fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above regarding Gressenich. Kosmas, as shown in Figs. 1b, 2b, 3b, 6b, 7b, and 8a-8d, describes a depression (3) disposed on one side of a glass ceramic plate (1). The depression (3) is not located in any particular relationship to pegs on an opposite side of the glass ceramic plate (1). Indeed, Kosmas fails to teach or suggest pegs as recited in amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, not only does Kosmas fail to teach or suggest a boss as recited in amended independent Claim 14, but Kosmas fails to teach or suggest any feature located with respect to a space or area free of pegs. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 14 and Claims 15, 16, and 18-20 depending therefrom patentably distinguish over any reasonable combination of Gressenich and Kosmas for at least the reasons discussed above.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 17 and 22 as obvious over Gressenich in view of Kosmas and further in view of either Goetz or Hoffmann, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17 and 22 patentably distinguish over Gressenich in view of Kosmas for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 14 does, from which Claims 17 and 22 depend.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Goetz and Hoffmann for the feature of display modules providing information such as heating power.<sup>1</sup> However, neither Goetz nor Hoffmann describes a boss as recited in amended independent Claim 14, much less a boss provided in a particular area with respect to an area free of pegs (as opposed to an area provided with pegs) as recited in amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants

---

<sup>1</sup> Outstanding Office Action, page 3.

respectfully submit that no reasonable combination of Gressenich, Kosmas, Goetz, and Hoffmann would include all of the features recited in either of dependent Claims 17 and 22.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 21 as obvious over Gressenich, Kosmas, and Medwick, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends from amended independent Claim 14 and patentably distinguishes over any reasonable combination of Gressenich and Kosmas for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 14 does.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Medwick for the feature of a peelable transparent protective sheet.<sup>2</sup> However, Medwick fails to teach or suggest a boss, much less a boss provided in a particular area with respect to an opposite surface including pegs as recited in amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no reasonable combination of Gressenich, Kosmas, and Medwick would include all of the features recited in amended independent Claim 14 or Claim 21 depending therefrom.

Newly added independent Claim 27 recites, in part:

wherein at least one smooth region, free of pegs, is reserved in a location on the first surface, in a mounted position, face to face with one or more elements viewable through the at least one smooth region, and the second surface includes a raised boss opposite a boundary of the at least one smooth region.

Accordingly, the boss is disposed opposite a **boundary** of the at least one smooth region. As discussed above regarding amended independent Claim 14, none of the cited references teaches or suggests a boss, much less a boss disposed opposite at least one smooth region provided on a surface including pegs as recited in amended independent Claim 14 and newly added independent Claim 27. Further, newly added Claim 27 recites that the boss is disposed opposite a **boundary** of the smooth region. Applicants respectfully submit that as none of the cited references teach or suggest the boss as recited in newly added Claim 27, none of the

---


<sup>2</sup> Outstanding Office Action, page 3.

cited references teaches or suggests the precise location of the boss as recited in newly added Claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that newly added independent Claim 27 patentably distinguishes over any reasonable combination of the cited references for at least the additional reasons discussed above.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)

Lee L. Stepina  
Registration No. 56,837